DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 256 95 SP 010 893

AUTHOR	Edelfelt, Roy A.; And Others
TITLE	Teacher-Designed Reform in Inservice Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-0683
PUB DATE	Jan 77
GRANT	OEG-0-71-3454(508)
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; Cooperating Teachers; *Developmental Programs; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Involvement; *Inservice Programs; Needs Assessment; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This is the final report of the project on Teacher-Designed Reform in Teacher Education. The focus of the project was primarily on inservice education to improve instruction. The rationale was that teachers should determine the content and design of inservice education at the school building level on the basis of the kind of staff they want and need to become, that goals for the development of the staff should be determined by the kind of staff needed to conduct the school program, and that the school programs should be decided by the needs and interests of students and parents. The project as initiated in three schools--an elementary school, a junior high school, and a senior high school--is described and analyzed. Some results indicate: (1) Teachers focused more on students; (2) Teacher-administrator working relationships were challenged; (3) New roles for professional associations were explored; (4) New ways of studying children and new avenues of communication between students and teachers were created; (5) The importance of the site for the project was determined; (6) Some latent and subliminal hostility, conflict, and jealousy among professional personnel was uncovered; (7) Allotment of time given to duties other than teaching became a serious consideration; (8) New methods of changing school policy were discovered; (9) An overview of the project itself revealed the need for some changes in approach and implementation. (JD)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED137256

Final Report

Project Number 1-0683
Grant Number OEG-0-71-3454 (508)

TEACHER-DESIGNED REFORM IN INSERVICE EDUCATION

Roy A. Edelfelt
Margo Johnson

with
assistance
from

Marielyn Frazier
Gary Gleason
Sandi Hartmann
Nancy Hildebrand
Stanley Jeffers
Lyle Lindelien
Susan Quick

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education
(Created by NEA)

Washington, D.C.
January 1977

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Point of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

SP010 893

Preface

This report on the second phase of the project entitled Teacher-Designed Reform in Inservice Education may be of special value to teachers anticipating involvement in the Teacher Centers authorized in the Education Amendments of 1976 to Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The local projects discussed in this report illustrate some of the prospects and some of the problems that teacher involvement in designing inservice education can bring. I would conclude from involvement in this project that participatory democracy in the teaching profession has great promise. It can unleash tremendous teacher energy and creativity. It can improve the climate of a school. But, as in all democratic arrangements, democracy is fraught with problems and difficulties. This report is one record of trying to democratize the profession at the action level.

I believe the entire report is instructive. For those who have less time, the "Results" and "Conclusions" will be edifying.

Many people were involved in the second phase of the project; only a few can be acknowledged here. The main contributors to this report are listed on the title page. Stan Jeffers of the Washington Education Association staff and Ed Lyle the Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction's staff, deserve special mention for their roles as consultants and guides to the project and their steadfast interest and involvement. Fred Andelman of the Massachusetts Teachers Association visited sites and provided an outside evaluation that lent a healthy measure of objectivity to data, and Herbert Hite of Western Washington State College gave of his time,

insight, and goodwill. But the most important participants were teachers in the schools involved. A complete roster of the teachers, along with a list of their association and school district responsibilities, is included in Appendix B.

Roy A. Edelfelt
Project Director

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1

Background..... 5

Parkview Elementary School..... 16

Roosevelt Junior High School..... 36

Port Angeles Senior High School..... 42

Epilogue..... 48

Results..... 52

Conclusions..... 56

References..... 61

Appendix A..... 62

Appendix B..... 65

Introduction

This is the second and final report of the project on Teacher-Designed Reform in Teacher Education. The proposal for the project was a challenge to all those educators--especially school administrators and college professors--who have traditionally planned and controlled inservice education for teachers. The challenge was offered because in 1971 the United States Office of Education brought together a committee of educators to advise it on national program priorities in teacher education,[1] and not a single teacher was among the members of the committee. As a consequence, staff of the National Education Association proposed that the Office of Education support a project to demonstrate that teachers could and should design their own inservice education and that teacher associations could successfully initiate and manage such programs.

The project was not intended to encompass all types of inservice education. The focus was primarily on inservice education to improve instruction. Briefly, the rationale was that teachers should determine the content and design of inservice education at the building level on the basis of the kind of staff they want and need to become, that goals for the development of the staff should be determined by the kind of staff needed to conduct the school program, and that the school program should be decided by the needs and interests of students and parents. All these determinations, of course, would be made within the context of American society so that a number of other influences come into play.

---

[1]For the committee's report, see Benjamin Rosner, The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972).

Implied in that rationale are certain procedural steps, including studying children, describing school programs and organization, and describing the faculty and the inservice education program needed to develop that faculty. The procedure culminates in the establishment of policy, the step intended to institutionalize teacher-designed reform as a continuous process.

Simple as the rationale and procedural steps may sound, it was far from easy to demonstrate them in practice. This report describes the attempt to implement them in several schools. Data are drawn from project logs and reports, meetings and interviews with the teachers involved, evaluations by teachers and outsiders, and the observations of the writers.

A major conclusion[2] of the project is that the rationale and procedural steps still seem valid after several years of trial at six sites. This conclusion supports the original assertion that teachers can design their own inservice education. But that assertion is not the whole story. In 1971, teachers and teacher associations were only beginning to be convincing about being involved in decision-making. In 1976, all parties have not been convinced, but nonetheless there is wide acceptance of the importance of teacher involvement. Also, there is now research to support the importance of teacher involvement if change is to be successful (Greenwood, Rann, & McLaughlin, 1975).

The scene has changed--or at least the rhetoric is different (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, & Nash, 1976)--and the base of power has shifted.

---

[2]Other conclusions appear on pages 56-60.

With parity now assured, teachers and teacher associations are willing to cooperate and collaborate with other groups and agencies: A strong organization need not fear being co-opted.

On the other hand, this project makes clear that some demands of teachers to be in charge need to be reexamined. For example, at one site a teacher was assigned to lead the project but, once in charge, she was no longer a teacher because her role and responsibilities had changed.

There also developed a realization that no group, teachers or others, can operate effectively alone. College and university professors, school administrators, and other educational personnel all have roles and areas of expertise that can contribute to improvement. The problem is not whether a service or resource is available from another group or agency but the conditions under which it is available and the attitude of the personnel who offer the assistance.

Finally, it should be recognized that the climate and the leadership of the nation have changed since the inception of this project in 1971. The mood of the country has been influenced by a major economic recession accompanied by substantial unemployment. Spirit and morale have been bruised by the Watergate scandal and revelations about the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The public has been confounded by the various arguments on scarcity, energy, and pollution. Integration and cultural pluralism remain issues with adamant advocates on each side. Discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic origin, and race persists despite federal legislation. The wounds of the Vietnam war are not yet healed. Poverty continues for 20% of our population, and middle-class and elderly people have been made poorer by inflation.

Although the economic picture is better and the psychological and soc'al declines have bottomed out, the worst of most of these human dilemmas provided the backdrop for the phase of the project reported here. Reform is not encouraged by indecision and disillusionment. Essential elements of reform such as risk-taking, trust, and objectivity are not characteristic of times like recent years. Thus, the fact that there was success at all may be a major accomplishment.

Background

The Teacher-Designed Reform in Teacher Education project was initiated by the National Education Association in 1971 with $31,345 in grants from the United States Office of Education and the National Institute of Mental Health.[3] It was conceived as a joint effort of national, state, and local education associations working in cooperation with state departments of education and local school districts. Named in the proposal as participants were the California Teachers Association, the Oregon Education Association, and the Washington Education Association. Working with these associations and with a special project consultant, the National Education Association developed the following rationale and procedural steps for the project:

> Teacher education, particularly in-service education, must serve the needs of practitioners so that they can respond effectively to the educational demands of students and society. To accomplish this, professional personnel, particularly teachers, must become sensitive to the needs and life-styles of students and have sufficient control over their own training, development, and professional performance to make each school an optimum operation in its time and place. Once teachers have a chance to determine what school should be like and what their roles should be, they can negotiate policy, conditions of work, and staff development programs that can achieve such reform in education and teacher education.
>
> Depending on teacher association initiative and professional negotiations to reform teacher education is a new approach. It is not intended to skirt or ignore traditional approaches through state departments of education or colleges and universities. It is intended to stimulate action by teachers in schools and to open an important new avenue for change, the argument being that reform in teaching and teacher edu-

---

[3]The grants were awarded to the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Washington, which subcontracted the work to the National Education Association.

cation can most directly be attacked in schools where teaching and learning actually take place.

Tacit assumptions about school and teaching cannot be left to chance. Inservice teacher education should be planned in terms of specified models of schools and defined roles for personnel who are to carry out the purposes of the schools /see Table 1/. (Edelfelt, Drummond, Sharpe, & Williams, 1972, p. 3.)

Procedural Steps

Step 1. Teams of teachers in a building will design ways of studying and describing the needs of the children with whom they work.

Step 2. Teams of teachers will analyze the data they collect.

Step 3. Teams of teachers will study what others have reported about the jobs of the school, the nature of children, the needs of society, the nature of change, and the ways of bringing change about.

Step 4. On the basis of what they have discovered, teachers will describe what their school should be like.

Step 5. By comparing this new model with what exists, teachers will identify needed changes.

Step 6. Teachers will indicate the changes in teacher roles and needed staff development.

Step 7. Teachers will use negotiations as one way of bringing about the proposed changes.

Step 8. Teachers, administrators, and institutions of higher education will develop programs consistent with the negotiated agreements, including inservice programs, renewal centers, protocol materials, and teaching models.

Step 9. Teachers, associations, and others involved will review their action and evaluate the impacts the changes have had on children and teachers. (Edelfelt et al., 1972, pp. 7-8.)

Each state association was responsible for sharing the rationale and procedural steps with two of its local associations, with the object of

Table 1
Illustrations of Possible Models of Schools

	Model A	Model B	Model C
Primary emphasis	Subject matter and skill development primary, academic subjects have priority	Intellectual, social, physical, aesthetic development	A productive life experience for students during years spent in school
Learning decided by	Learning developed sequentially by experts and professionals	Learning developed along individual and personal lines, depending on the student's ability and interest	Learning determined by students with consultation of teachers, parents, and community contact people
Content determined by	Curriculum content dispensed by teachers and texts and workbooks	Content drawn from all sources of knowledge, depending on problems a student or students are attacking	Content incidental to learning; emphasis on learning how to learn, to inquire, to make decisions or draw conclusions -- encounter with experience as it comes up being the major determinant
Curriculum organization	Curriculum organized around subjects, courses, or disciplines	Curriculum organized around the individual development of each student	Curriculum organized around the experience students have, the problems they face
Teacher's main function	Teaching involves directing student's learning along prescribed lines	Teaching includes any form of interaction with students that is designed to assist learning	Teacher mainly a sounding board, a constructive critic, a resource person

Table 1 (cont.)

	Model A	Model B	Model C
Criteria for learning	Evaluation of learning largely by paper-and-pencil teacher-made or standardized tests	Evaluation of learning employs multiple devices for assessment, with emphasis on behavioral change and self appraisal	Evaluation of learning based primarily on student-developed goals -- assessed by students as well as faculty and community-involved people
Schedule for school learning	School day 5-5½ hours, five days a week, 175-190 days a year	"School" extended to any hours devoted to learning -- in or out of school under the auspices of school	School serves as the base from which work-study program extends -- essentially, calendar is developed for the individual and includes the entire year
Organization of students	Students organized into classes, taught in classes, and grouped by age and academic ability within age group	Students organized, in groups or individually, in terms of purposes -- determined by students, teachers, and parents	Students organized sociometrically, this balanced with teacher having some options to organize for new exposures
Organization of teachers	Teachers organized in faculties by grade at elementary level and subject at high school level	Teachers organized into teams, including a variety of types of personnel -- professional, paraprofessional, and ancillary	Teachers organized and reorganized periodically -- for students' benefit and to ensure their own vitality and challenge; central guideline is bringing together a vital, productive, stimulating team

(Edelfelt et al., 1972, pp. 4-5)

securing the participation of at least one. The local associations had to accept the rationale and procedural steps as given but were assured of ample opportunity to shape the project, overall as well as locally.

The first such opportunity was a September 1971 meeting that was called to establish criteria for final site selection and set a schedule for implementation. Participating in the meeting were representatives of two local associations each in California, Oregon, and Washington, representatives of the departments of education in these three states, and state and national association personnel. The criteria for site selection, as later expanded and clarified, were:

1. support and sponsorship by the local education association and intent and willingness to participate on the part of a significant number of building staff;
2. evidence that the local association has explored the assistance available from such sources as staff of the local and state associations, the local parent-teacher association, and nearby colleges and universities;
3. endorsement by the local administration and the local school board, demonstrated by letter or resolution, to be accompanied by a report on the local (or state) situation regarding negotiations or other means of effecting change in policy;
4. a high percentage of association membership among building staff;
5. diversity among sites in geography, socioeconomic status of community, and size of school;
6. willingness of the local education association to work cooperatively with the state education association and the National Education Association;

7. the prospect that inservice education is amenable to negotiation or other means of agreement;
8. willingness of the local association to evaluate process and product, that is, its willingness to keep its own records (logs) of plans and accomplishments and also to have plans and accomplishments evaluated externally;
9. potential for the project to be a productive exercise;
10. potential for the project to make the local association's initiative visible and to capitalize on the visibility;
11. potential for continuation of project ideas after initial trial;
12. potential for collaboration with non-site support groups--for example, the state department of education, colleges and universities, regional laboratories, and state advisory committees on teacher education;
13. the apparent need for such a project. (Paraphrased from Edelfelt et al., 1972, p. 42.)

Following the September meeting, local association representatives returned home to ascertain whether their site could meet the criteria. Four of the six local associations ultimately did meet them and established a project: the Hayward (California) Unified Teachers Association, at Hillcrest School; the San Diego (California) Teachers Association, at Taft Junior High School; the Springfield (Oregon) Education Association, at Moffitt Elementary School; and the Bellingham (Washington) Education Association, at Parkview Elementary School.

The schedule for implementation projected that sites would initiate their efforts in late October 1971 and complete procedural steps 1-6 by

April 1972. The outcomes of the 1971-72 year, including a precis of each site's efforts, are reported in Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education (Edelfelt et al., 1972).

A proposal for renewed funding of the project was submitted in November 1972; however, additional money was not granted until April 1973. The dry spell did not bring the project to a halt, for each site had some money that had been allocated to it earlier on the basis of projected plans, and also some local and state resources were tapped. However, during this period the project was unable to hold any of the regular meetings of all site representatives that had served as a stimulus for local program development.

In March 1973, as prospects for renewed funding brightened, project leaders organized a meeting to hear about each site's progress relative to its original proposal. At a follow-up meeting in May, participants revised the procedural steps to reflect their two years of experience and some political realities. The revised version follows:

Step 1. Teachers in a school will study students and describe the needs of the children with whom they work. They will also gather opinions from parents on their desires for children in school.

Step 2. Teachers will analyze these data.

Step 3. Teachers will study what others have reported about the jobs of the school, the nature of children, the needs of society, the nature of change, and the ways of bringing change about.

Step 4. On the basis of what they have discovered, teachers will describe what their school should be like.

Step 5. By comparing this new model with what exists, teachers will identify needed changes.

Step 6. Teachers will describe needed changes in the ways they work together and with children and carry out staff development to implement such changes.

Step 7. In order to assure a teacher designed staff development program the local teachers association will negotiate policy or use other approaches to achieve policy development. This includes facilitating other changes desired as a result of the project study and providing the appropriate support to make such policy operative.

Step 8. Teacher associations will endeavor to initiate cooperative programs with school district and higher education consistent with the agreements and policy developed to promote staff development and other activities tested in the pilot settings. This should include cooperative, periodic evaluation and review to assess what has been institutionalized and the impact of the project on students and teachers. (Teacher Designed Reform, 1973-74, p. 2.)

The major substantive change was in Steps 7 and 8, where responsibility for seeking changes in policy was transferred from teachers to teacher associations. The intent was to underscore the local association's role in the project and distinguish between what teachers can accomplish individually as school-district employees and what they can do collectively through their professional organizations. Other substantive changes were the addition to Step 1 of parent opinion as a source of data and the consolidation of Steps 8 and 9, making evaluation an integral part of cooperative programs.

Additionally, for Step 4, the representatives listed 12 questions to be answered in developing a model school:

1. What is the primary emphasis of the school?
2. What is the primary professional role of the teacher?
3. Who decides what learning experiences are to be?
4. In what ways do teachers facilitate learning?
5. How is content determined?
6. How is the curriculum organized?
7. How is learning evaluated?

8. How is time utilized?

9. How are students organized for learning?

10. What staffing patterns are employed?

11. How do teachers spend their professional time?

12. What opportunities are provided for professional growth?

(Teacher Designed Reform, 1973-74, p. 1.)

Although project leaders hoped that all four sites would continue their affiliation with the project in 1973-74, they had but one firm commitment as September approached. The other three sites were only tentatively committed.

At Hillcrest School in Hayward, California, the teachers leading the project were attempting to influence certain conditions surrounding it; the support of the principal and continued assistance from a guidance counselor were the primary bones of contention. The executive director of the Hayward Unified Teachers Association met with the teacher who codirected the project locally, staff from the California Teachers Association, and the national project director, and they decided that a meeting with the school superintendent should be arranged to reach some agreements on the above and other "influencing conditions." The meeting was held and satisfactory agreements were reached. As summer 1973 progressed, however, the agreements were never carried out and the Hayward Association reluctantly withdrew from the project.

In San Diego the project had operated in one school on a school-within-a-school campus. The teachers involved were a special group within the larger faculty who were striving for more humaneness in schools. They were assertive, independent, protective of their autonomy, creative, and nonconformist. In 1971 and 1972, pressures were not too great, and these

teachers developed some unique approaches and programs. As 1973 unfolded, however, school problems began to take more time and to strain their tolerance. The school principal, who had been supportive and protective, was rumored to be leaving. Central office policy began to tighten up. Teachers in the project were not being listened to in the filling of a vacancy on their staff. Time itself became a problem. In order to be able to deal with the concerns related to the daily operation of the school, the staff voted to withdraw from the project.

In Springfield, Oregon, the Moffitt School was forced to terminate its participation because of circumstances beyond its control. The state association staff person who had served as project liaison for two years left in June 1973 and was not replaced. Because the project's policy was to work with local associations only through the state association, the site at Springfield could no longer be supported.

Thus, of the four original sites, only Parkview School remained in fall 1973. It was not the sole project site that fall, however; explorations for new sites had been under way for many months. Although it was thought desirable to continue activity in the three original states, funding was tighter and it appeared wise to limit projects to the state of Washington until more money was in sight. Joining Parkview School in fall 1973 was Roosevelt Junior High School in Port Angeles, Washington. The following spring, Port Angeles Senior High School also became a site. The three chapters that follow focus on what happened at these three sites from the time of their affiliation with the project until the termination of their activities as project sites. (In the case of Parkview School the first year is reported in brief because it is covered in Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education by Edelfelt et al.) Coupled with a

narrative on the plans and accomplishments at each site is an account of its own efforts to evaluate its work. The final chapter presents conclusions and recommendations for the entire project from its inception to its close.

Parkview Elementary School[4]

Parkview Elementary School, one of 13 elementary schools in Bellingham, includes kindergarten through grade five plus special education classes. At the inception of the project, Parkview's faculty (including the principal) numbered 15 and its students 312. In fall 1972, the figures increased to 20 and 420 respectively as Parkview absorbed part of the population of a school that was closed. Fall 1974 figures were 22 staff (excluding personnel on grant funds) and 361 students.

The project on teacher-designed reform was undertaken at the school only after the staff was consulted and voted to participate. Parkview's participation was subsequently endorsed by the Bellingham School Board, the assistant superintendent of Bellingham School District, the Executive Board of the Bellingham Education Association, and the Association's Representative Council. The latter "indicated /its/ willingness to negotiate for changes and training that /might/ result from the project."

The first year of the project at Parkview was devoted to procedural steps 1-6 (see p. 6). In the fall and winter, the staff studied children, using a variety of methods: shadow studies, in which teachers visited other Bellingham schools and observed a selected child in his or her classroom interactions; children's responses to questions such as "What do you like/dislike about school?"; children's completion of sentences--for example, "School is the most fun when . . ."; teacher-child conferences; and a questionnaire on out-of-school activities and circum-

---

[4]Quotations in this section were taken from reports and logs written by Nancy Hildebrand, project director from fall 1974 to spring 1975, and Marielyn Frazier, project codirector from fall 1971 to fall 1974.

stances. In March 1972 the staff sought parents' opinions on school matters by interviewing 65 Parkview families (of about 180 total) selected at random from each grade level. In the interviews, teachers discussed 22 topics with parents. A written opinionnaire on the same topics was then left with parents to complete, and 73 of these were returned. Subsequently, the parent opinionnaire was adapted and used with Parkview students in grades two to five and with 19 randomly selected Parkview alumni in the sixth and ninth grades. Additionally, a few Parkview teachers visited another project site and some other schools to learn about such practices as contract teaching, use of resource teachers in special education, and free schools. Most teachers also took advantage of newly purchased or borrowed books to become familiar with current educational issues and ideas. Finally, the staff surveyed themselves on likes and dislikes about Parkview.

Following tabulation and some preliminary analysis of data, the staff met several times in April 1972 to review the findings and then identified their criteria for a model school:

I. Primary Emphasis

To meet the needs of the child by assisting in the development of a well-adjusted human being who has the ability to use basic skills and make appropriate decisions.

II. Learnings

Ultimately determined by society, interpreted and implemented by teachers, parents, and students.

III. Content

Should be determined by professional educators utilizing guidelines based upon knowledge of principles of child growth and development and with parental and student suggestions for material with which to build.

IV. Curriculum Organization

Curriculum should be planned and organized by professional educators utilizing suggestions from parents and students.

V. Teacher's Main Function

To guide students to personal fulfillment.

VI. Criteria for the Measurement of Learning

A demonstrated change in behavior.

VII. Time Schedule for School Learning

Should remain flexible based on sound educational principles to be organized around the needs of the child.

VIII. Organization of Students

Should be flexible depending on objectives, purposes, or nature of activity.

IX. Organization of Teachers

Should remain flexible allowing for individual differences and preferences.

The staff also determined the personnel needed for the model school and the criteria necessary for their success:

> The staff of Parkview Model School should consist of a principal, classroom teachers, reading improvement teacher, resource teacher, counselor, music, physical education, and art teachers, aides, secretary and custodians.
>
> The staff should reflect a range of ages, interests, abilities and experiences. Racial make-up of the staff should parallel that of the community. Staff should consist of both men and women.
>
> Members of the staff should be flexible, empathetic, compassionate, tolerant, knowledgeable, and ethical. The individuals should have a positive self-concept, sense of humor, a wide spectrum of interests and a lot of stamina. Each member should have a desire to continue to grow professionally.

The following staff development needs were then determined for 1972-73:

1. How to individualize learning in practical ways, especially for Parkview.

2. How to use auxiliary personnel.

3. How to develop awareness skills, awareness of students and their needs.

4. Have opportunity within staff to share current educational issues.

5. How to weld two schools next year. Devise some ways of getting to know next year's students.

6. How to team teach.

As recounted in Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education (Edelfelt et al., 1972), in 1971-72 "the Parkview School staff succeeded in describing the school they think essential for their school population, the kind of faculty their school should have, and the inservice training needs of faculty . . . Several sources of data indicated that child study prompted teachers to listen more to children. Teachers recognized that they had not been 'tuned in' adequately. Apparently part of the inservice development was a change in teacher awareness and behavior. Parent contact also proved productive and gratifying, especially when considered along with student input" (pp. 13-14).

Parkview's efforts from fall 1972 until the project's termination in summer 1975 were devoted to procedural steps 7-8 and also to steps 1-6 a second time around. The model school sketched in February 1972 was twice revised, first in March 1974 and again in March 1975. The latter version follows:

I. Primary Emphases

The primary emphases of Parkview School will be to meet the needs of children:

1. by assisting them in their development as well-adjusted human beings with better self images and respect for one another;

2. by fostering their abilities to use basic skills and to make appropriate decisions.

II. Learnings

Participating in the educational experience at Parkview will help prepare children to make decisions and accept responsibility for those decisions in learning to live and work together.

III. Content

The Parkview staff accepts responsibility for promoting the learning of basic skills and for encouraging children's interests and skill development with opportunities for personal growth and success.

IV. Curriculum Organization

Teachers will continue to plan most academic offerings. The children may request and select electives; plan, organize, and choose station work, culminations, field trips, and interclass functions. Children who exhibit ability to be independent workers will be encouraged with more autonomy.

V. Teacher's Main Functions

The functions of a Parkview teacher will be:

1. to guide and facilitate the studies of children;

2. to enjoy interacting with children;

3. to be a sympathetic and empathetic listener;

4. to further children's sense of personal worth and fulfillment;

5. to identify individual needs, to help children set both behavioral and academic goals and to help them progress toward their goals;

6. to keep abreast of new developments in their instructional areas.

VI. Criteria for the Measurement of Learning

The criteria continue to be changes in behavior, with children being urged to collect supporting data and to make their own value judgments.

VII. Time Schedule for Learning

Schedules will remain flexible; based on sound principles of learning; organized around the needs of children; and with chances for independent children to schedule their own time (especially fourth and fifth graders).

VIII. Organization of Students

Organization will be flexible depending upon objectives, purposes, and nature of learning activities.

Provisions will be made for parent involvement as resources and as input in decision making.

Some part-time ability grouping may occur where needs and interests indicate.

IX. Organization of Teachers

Staff organization will be flexible and may include:

1. floating resource teachers in academic areas to work with children requiring independent grouping or enrichment;

2. team teaching with responsibilities shared in areas of expertise;

3. differential staffing making use of master teachers, certified classroom teachers, specialists, elementary counselors, interns, paraprofessionals, parents, and college professional resources;

4. completely new organization and management patterns such as continuous progress, family grouping, and others.

X. Inservice

Teachers will be responsible for identifying and assessing their own needs as well as the needs of children on a continuous basis. They will determine appropriate strategies for meeting the identified needs and design, request, and carry out their own inservice programs.

The above version emerged after the staff once again surveyed parent opinions, studied students, and assessed teacher needs. The parent questionnaire, which was distributed to 420 parents and 25 staff, drew 230 and 20 responses respectively. It was designed to gather data comparable to

the 1972 survey plus some additional information. Opinions were sought on the following topics: methods of grouping children, homework, the need for a counselor, appropriate and inappropriate behaviors in school, acceptable and unacceptable punishments, children's ability to plan their own schedule, children's involvement in decision-making, the function of the school in developing children's personal and social skills, factors for a child's successful living, alternatives for children who do not master skills, methods of reporting to parents, parents' role in decision-making, curriculum areas needing more or less emphasis, and discipline. In December 1974, approximately 150 students in grades three, four, and five were surveyed on some of the same topics. That same month Parkview teachers completed the National Education Association's Teacher Instructional Needs Assessment, and in January 1975 they completed a Self and Others Rating Scale.

The effort expended on these activities was not focused alone on revising the criteria for a model school. Staff development, along the lines first identified in April 1972 and later modified, was actively pursued. The traditional approach of supporting one or two teachers to attend a particular program outside the district was followed in many cases, but with two important modifications: The program had to be related to the development needs of the total staff; and the teachers who benefitted directly "shared their learning with the entire staff when they returned /through/ . . . teacher-designed inservice workshops held at /Parkview School/ with local staff as leaders."

More important, the staff on their own designed several workshops related to the needs they had identified. "Interpersonal Communications

Skills" was one such workshop, conducted at Parkview by a faculty member from nearby Western Washington State College on alternate Wednesdays over a 10-week period. The faculty member, who was selected by Parkview staff after they considered the possibilities at the College, planned the first session; the Parkview teachers then designed the remaining sessions according to their interests and the faculty member's skills. Another teacher-designed program was a film seminar on "Childhood Behaviors and Discipline," offered to both parents and teachers through the combined efforts of the Teacher-Designed Reform project, the Bellingham Education Association, the school district, and the local parent-teacher-student association.

The staff apparently learned to be very resourceful in financing staff development, often using outside funds--from the school district, Title I, Western Washington State College, and the Bellingham Education Association--as well as some out-of-pocket money.

Beginning in 1972 and each year after, Parkview staff sought to have desired changes negotiated into policy. Between fall 1972 and summer 1975, 10 proposals were submitted to the Bellingham Education Association for possible negotiation with the school district. These proposals and their status or disposition are described below:

1. A proposal that the school district hire counselors for its elementary schools. The initial proposal, submitted in fall 1972, was to hire a counselor for Parkview on a trial basis. It was reintroduced several times in succeeding years, broadened to encompass counselors at four schools, but still as a pilot program. In this form, the proposal was on the agenda for negotiation in 1976, this time with the backing of a Citizens Committee.

2. A proposal to allow inservice training programs to be organized on petition by five certified employees of the district. First introduced on a trial basis for the 1972-73 school year, the proposal was negotiated into policy in February 1973 (see Appendix A.)

3. A proposal for "creative playgrounds." This subject was first broached in early 1972. The ensuing negotiations agreement provided for a committee of teachers, parents, and administrators to study new playground equipment and recommend purchases. No action was taken on the committee's recommendations in the 1972-73 school year. However, the 1973-74 negotiations agreement provided for the expenditure of $11,000 on new playground equipment for 11 elementary schools.

4. A proposal for planning time for intermediate-grade teachers. This proposal was introduced in spring 1973. The agreement negotiated for 1973-74 committed the district to employing specialists who would "provide three 45-minute periods of physical education, two 30-minute periods of music and one 30-minute library period per week" for students in grades four, five, and six. The teachers were to use this time for preparation. A later revision of the agreement stated that the preparation time was to be "during the regular instructional school day, exclusive of the duty-free lunch period." The revision also extended the policy to include grades three, seven, and eight. Under this agreement and the earlier one, physical education and music were scheduled by the district. A second revision was nego-

tiated in 1974 to give individual buildings autonomy in scheduling these periods.

5. A spring 1973 proposal that early-dismissal days already negotiated by the Bellingham Education Association might be used for teacher-initiated workshops (as well as district-wide workshops) and for sharing of talents among building staff members. Negotiated into the 1974-75 agreement were five early-dismissal days per year "to be used by teachers and administrators to work on specific curriculum projects or on other professional activities."
6. A proposal that a pool of substitute teachers be selected and trained by Parkview staff for exclusive work at Parkview. Submitted in spring 1973, this item was not accepted for negotiation.
7. A proposal that Parkview staff be involved in selecting new Parkview teachers. This item too was submitted in spring 1973 and failed to be accepted for negotiation.
8. A proposal to give individual schools autonomy in designing and implementing inservice programs and an accompanying item seeking "changes in professional credit requirements tc include workshops and staff development designed by and for each individual building staff." These items were first submitted in February 1974. They were tried out district-wide in 1974-75 and became negotiated policy in June 1975 (see Appendix A). The policy provides that teachers must earn 60 units of professional credit every five years. Half of the units must be devoted to individual development and paid for by the individual. The other 30 must be for staff development at the building or district level;

these units are earned on school time and financed by the district. (Previous policy required six college credits every five years and did not specify whether the credits should relate to individual or staff needs. Under the new policy, one college credit equals ten units of professional credit.)

9. A proposal for policies regarding the handling of disruptive students. First submitted for the 1974-75 negotiations, this item is still being refined for possible negotiation.

10. Proposed guidelines for student teacher selection. Parkview teachers began to develop the guidelines in spring 1973, with the intent of improving Parkview's relationship with Western Washington State College in the training of student teachers. Although originally conceived as a possible item for negotiation, the guidelines were ultimately assigned to a task force consisting of representatives from Western Washington State College, the Bellingham Education Association, and the Bellingham School District. As of spring 1976, the task force had recommended a new procedure that would jointly involve student teachers, teachers, principals, and clinical professors in the assignment of student teachers.

Prior to 1974-75, the Parkview project's links to higher education had been through particular individuals who were asked to render services. In early 1974, Parkview staff and representatives of the Teacher Corps program at Western Washington State College were brought together by staff of the National Education Association and the Washington Education Association to explore a formal relationship between the school and the college.

The contact was made because of new legislation that would soon concentrate Teacher Corps efforts on "the retraining of experienced teachers." Western Washington State College apparently saw Parkview "as a site which could be used as a model for staff development and professional growth by the other four schools involved in Western's Teacher Corps program." The state and national teacher associations saw the Teacher Corps program as a possible continuation and expansion of what the Teacher-Designed Reform project had started. In fall 1974, with the approval of the Parkview staff and with support from the Teacher Corps, Parkview became a special project to explore the potential of teacher-designed inservice education for the Teacher Corps model.

The relationship between Parkview and Western Washington State College in 1974-75 was transitional, for the Teacher Corps was still in a phase of training undergraduates to be teachers. The transitional plan involved using "regular fee-paying students" at the College as clinical students at Parkview. The clinical students and their training staff--a clinical professor from the College, a team leader from Parkview (elected by the staff), the cooperating teachers, and a research assistant--"would support the inservice Parkview component by providing resources, services, and opportunities for the classroom teachers, as individuals or in groups . . . to further their professional growth and pursue their needs."

In the fall and winter of 1974, the team leader and the research assistant (a certified teacher) did short stints in classes, freeing regular teachers for conferences with clinical students, field trips with groups of children, and visits to other schools. Also, both project funds and Teacher Corps funds made it possible for Parkview teachers to participate in or organize a variety of inservice education programs.

By spring quarter, the five clinical students had demonstrated their competence according to the College's criteria and began to share teaching responsibilities more fully, giving their cooperating teachers time for other professional tasks.

The relationship with the Teacher Corps brought other resources to Parkview as well. On several occasions, the Teacher Corps clinical professor "demonstrated specific teaching techniques, particularly in the area of inquiry," for the benefit of clinical students and cooperating teachers. Additionally, Teacher Corps funds directly supported two workshops requested by teachers, teacher participation in several workshops and conferences, visits to other Teacher Corps sites, and the purchase of some instructional materials.

Another feature of the relationship--unique for both Western Washington State College and Parkview--was the availability of college credit to Parkview staff for teacher-designed inservice education related to Parkview's goals. The credits were offered for independent projects that would improve instruction directly, or indirectly by assessing needs or evaluating a program. The opportunity attracted nine teachers in fall quarter, five in winter quarter, and two in spring quarter. Among the projects were a plan for teacher-student conferences and enrichment experiences for gifted and independent students.

From the outset, the Parkview staff had made it a policy that participation in the Teacher-Designed Reform project had to win the support of a majority each fall or the project would be terminated. Support was waning in fall 1974 because the staff was weary of the time and effort involved on top of regular classroom loads and professional obligations.

But though the incentives to continue were apparently weak, the attractiveness of the beginning relationship with the Teacher Corps overrode these concerns and the project entered its fourth year. By January 1975, however, the staff had decided that they wanted to continue designing their own inservice education but to terminate their formal affiliation with the Teacher-Designed Reform project. They did not terminate their relationship with the Teacher Corps. Perhaps because that relationship provided local and more visible support (in the form of a team leader and two certified graduate students the second year), offered considerable latitude with respect to type of involvement, entailed little intervention, and called for few written procedures, the Parkview staff voted to continue as a special Teacher Corps project at least for 1975-76.

Local Evaluation

As the preceding description indicates, needs assessments, opinion surveys, and open-ended questionnaire surveys were conducted several times during the life of the project. They provided the staff with valuable data for planning and also for comparing responses at various time intervals, but few were designed to compare "before" and "after" on the basis of expected changes. Thus, although the analyses of data did note areas of consistency and change in response, on the whole they did not relate these phenomena to particular project efforts. In other words, they were used primarily for planning rather than for assessment of progress.

The Parkview staff did, however, assess the impact of the project. They informally evaluated the project at weekly meetings, occasionally reordering their priorities to square with their judgments. Also, they formally evaluated the project twice, in 1972 and 1975. In 1972, Parkview

teachers were asked to indicate their agreement with project assumptions and their judgment on various aspects and activities of the project. The data indicated very strong support for the assumptions and generally positive assessments of leadership and communication once the project got under way. Selected responses to a question about the value of the project follow:

- It has caused me to reevaluate some of our subjects--when enough of the students dislike something--there has to be a reason for it.

- It has helped to solidify my own belief in priorities. It has seemed to cement a closer relationship among the Staff, partly through a healthful venting of strong likes and dislikes of actions, philosophies, etc.

- Getting to know parents better, really trying to understand children and their wants. The opportunity to understand other staff members better and the chance to visit other schools.

- A project of this sort forces participants to soul search and evaluate the status quo. This is always a valuable experience, usually benefitting all. Such a demanding project (in terms of time) might better be undertaken when there are no other extra demands on time, such as playground construction, etc.

- If we can implement some of the ideas effectively, I think that we will have made real progress.

- It reinforced the fact that most parents agree with us--first the 3 R's and discipline, then the rest.

- Reinforced some of the principles of learning we already knew about. Made me feel good to know that most of the parents support our program. Motivated me to get busy and do some extra reading I've been wanting to do. Motivated me to visit the cooperative school which I've wanted to do for a long time. Got me thinking about and exploring new ideas.

- If nothing else comes of this project the experience was worthwhile to me in that it made me take another look at myself in the role of "teacher." I am now evaluating daily with a more definite purpose. Also, I think it has made me feel more free to try different approaches with children and question the necessity of everyone learning the same thing at the same time.

- Chances to visit other schools and homes. Learned a few things from children, although not a great deal I didn't already know. Parents' opinions were approximately what I expected--better school discipline and an emphasis on the 3 R's. Required to do some careful thinking about own goals and methods. I'd be just as happy to drop the whole thing next year with possible exceptions of some inservice training to help the nonacademic child provided it is not during the summer.

The second attempt to assess the project's impact was made in spring 1975 when staff were asked to judge the year's accomplishments and shortcomings. Selected comments appear below:

Accomplishments

- I think we have learned a great deal from the project, and I, as an individual have benefitted in many ways. Because it has been a long period of time, it's hard to realize how much change in teaching style is attributable to the project or how much would have been a result of teaching experience and maturity. I think my approach to kids has been influenced by our work.

- Interpersonal relations were easier this year. In fact, the attitude of the entire school was greatly improved from the way it was at the beginning of the project. /This teacher was at another school one of the interim years./

- I feel this (project) should be an ongoing thing. My benefits are upgrading of my skills, both teaching and interpersonal; development of new materials; and utilizing new methods. I also feel closer to the rest of the staff as well as my students. I don't think I have been as close to my students since my first year of teaching.

- The released time for teachers . . . was extremely valuable--probably the difference in making it a good year for those who participated.

- There seems to be more communication among the whole staff in the area of policy in dealing with children's discipline.

- First year we've been able to design our own college credits individually.

- I liked having auxiliary personnel to augment teaching staff for various purposes such as conferencing, small group field trips, etc.

- The most important thing that we learned in the project is that it's very difficult to effect substantial, or even token change, in the public school institution because of the adamant and conservative attitudes of its "leaders."

- I think there was an educational benefit to our involvement in the sense that emphasis upon improvement and different ways of doing things requires careful scrutiny of those things being done and a careful consideration of the reasons for doing them. I would say the gains were general and pervasive rather than specific.

- I have appreciated the positive things learned through the project; however, I believe the thing went on far too long so that there almost seemed to be a split within faculty. With all the talk about communication skills, I felt we were having more of a problem than before in some cases.

- One can't go through such an experience without gaining understandings in one area or another. However, by the fourth year I had begun to lose interest. Also the changes that were happening personally (baby) tended to draw my attention into other directions during after school hours. Quite frankly, I feel we are ready to leave the project behind and utilize that which we have learned in our classroom activities and also use after school meeting time for other types of planning.

- Have found that teachers can design inservice workshops. Those workshops are more meaningful and useful to us. The school district must sense this because they have included teachers in planning their workshops. One difficulty still is getting the time to "do our own thing."

- I found the involvement in the Project to be enriching to me. I detested the long hours of meetings (not actually the meetings themselves but their interference with blocks of time much needed for other things) and the pressure of deadlines for paper work. I enjoyed the interaction with the other members of the staff, even though it became abrasive at times. Any kind of deep involvement with other human beings seems better to me than shallow relationships day after day with the conversations limited to dieting and gossip.

Shortcomings

- I am disappointed in the overall effect of the project considering the time, money and effort which has been put into it. I think that some very innovative and workable ideas were brought out but it was discouraging to me to see them get no further than on paper. Possibly we didn't use the negotiations procedure to full advantage?

- I believe that one of the biggest mistakes was made last year when the faculty was split against continuing the project for another year. At this point we did not have a "team" and in my opinion you can't win a ball game without team support. I am not saying that the project should have been dropped, but I am saying that changes should have been made that would have been more conducive to a successful climate, again. Again, if it was decided to carry on.

- I feel Parkview accomplished most of its own goals. The /National Education Association's/ goals of institutionalizing policies were too difficult to achieve.

- I believe we should have had active /Bellingham Education Association/ backing so that we had some muscle in our negotiations requests. Further, BEA could have been an active public relations agent for us so everyone knew what we were doing that was different--both the district and other schools!

- I feel that we are just getting it together! We haven't accomplished the goal of making the children responsible for their own actions but this is beginning to see some light. It takes time for both the kids and the teachers to learn the methods. We all need to follow our plans and be consistent.

- I think we are becoming aware of more needs of the students and ourselves but so far meeting them has been too much in the discussion stage. Trying to get consensus is tough.

- Time schedules and organization of students have not changed that I'm aware of. The re-organization of primary teachers has been talked about for three years and we are still doing our own thing!

- I feel much of the project was theory, figures without a practical purpose and covered too broad a spectrum.

- Most of the people attending workshops in other areas did not share new ideas with others in group sessions.

- We didn't achieve any grand, larger, noticeable changes in program. Actually, I'm not sure this was an objective, but I've heard this objection from the staff.

- I'm not sure we did enough with the parent opinionnaire; all we did was use it to rewrite the model school and report it to various agencies.

- And what of the kids' changes in attitudes about school? Why were the middle graders' attitudes so far more negative at the end of the year?

- It's obviously most important to have the administrator with you all the way, both in visibility and in philosophy.

- I think that I have grown as an effective teacher, even though the next year I plan to bag some of my innovations that developed during the project. I no longer think they are appropriate for primary children. I hope to be able to develop more satisfying (to both children and teacher) innovations to replace them.

- I think it unfortunate that the administrative figure was missing from many of the meetings and workshops. I think that presence would probably be one of the key factors in long term carry-over of involvements in any such project.

The team leader's conclusions about the project's benefits were as follows:

1. Improved teacher-teacher communication and understanding.

2. Increased /awareness/ of current developments in education. Putting some new ideas into practice.

3. Improved mutual support and developed a personal esprit de corps.

4. Acceptance of each others' stage of professional development, particularly with the interns and valued each one's uniqueness, teacher, studen:, parent.

5. Better communication and involvement with parents and children.

6. Improved awareness of children's needs--we listen more, we meet more individuals on <u>their</u> level.

7. Practiced a variety of new techniques all of which worked for some one of us. These we added to our teaching strategies.

8. Designed, organized, and carried out our inservice plans.

9. Got a taste of how difficult it is to be truly democratic--in trying to help kids assume responsibility for their own behavior.

10. Ran headlong into the lag between research and practical applications; found out how difficult it is to change institutions.

The team leader also concluded that "most of the project's outcomes, benefits and failures alike, would not have been achieved without the direct support, active involvement, and keen interest of Parkview's princi-

pal; his use of participatory rather than authoritarian management, his positive self-image, and his recognition of the growth possible for the children at Parkview as well as for himself and the staff, were vital to the overall success of the project."

Roosevelt Junior High School[5]

Roosevelt is one of two junior high schools in Port Angeles. It encompasses grades seven through nine. Its enrollment in fall 1974 was about 900 students, and 45 persons constituted its faculty.

Following an orientation to the Teacher-Designed Reform project in March 1973, representatives from Roosevelt got together a team of 13 faculty members (including the principal) and sketched a plan for teacher-designed reform at the school. The following May they secured the support of the Executive Board of the Port Angeles Education Association, and three months later the Port Angeles superintendent and school board gave their approval.

The initial plan was to revamp the school's general-math and shop curriculums to address the needs and goals of students who did not plan to go to college. The revamping was to draw on data from aptitude tests, from a citizen's survey, from students, from teachers' visits to one another's classes and other schools, and from existing literature. The project hoped "to tie the student's math, shop, English, and the vocational guidance programs into a working unit" that would prepare students for the world of work and the demands of living in our society. Chief among the proposed strategies for integrating the several curriculums was team teaching.

Implementation of the plan was delayed for about seven months while renewed funding was awaited. In March 1974, the project received a small

---

[5]Quotations in this section were taken from project proposals, correspondence, and reports written by Gary Gleason, project codirector.

advance to begin its work and to refine its plans into strategies more closely paralleling the rationale and procedural steps of the overall project. In the refined plan, ninth-grade math was singled out for attention because it was the last mathematics course required for high school graduation. Project personnel thought that this course should provide "students not desiring nor qualified for college /with/ the basic mathematical competency needed to be successfully employed and to efficiently manage a home." Additionally, a second problem was identified: disruptive students, that is, students "whose past experiences in school have caused /them/ to react defensively against further failure by daydreaming, by causing disturbances, or by simply refusing to make any effort." This second area was included in order to involve more teachers in the project and also to meet some needs of the school's staff.

To revamp the curriculums, project personnel specified three major tasks: surveying the parents of students in all seventh-grade math classes and all ninth-grade general-math classes; surveying local industries; and team teaching math and homeroom classes and math and shop classes. By June 1974 the two surveys had been conducted and responses had been tallied by the math teachers. About 170 parents returned the questionnaire, indicating the math skills they considered most important for their children to have. This information was presented to all Roosevelt teachers, who were asked to indicate which math skills students needed to do the work in their classes. (For example, were skills in working with fractions needed in shop or home economics?) Responses to the second questionnaire were received from about 70 industries (of 130 in the survey), yielding information on the math skills needed by employees of those industries and the level of skill among recently hired employees.

These early attempts to collect data were supplemented in spring 1975 when Roosevelt's two counselors conducted oral interviews with a random sample of ninth-grade math students. Students were asked what they were studying in math and what they expected to learn and use.

Data from all three surveys were shared with Roosevelt's math teachers, and the data from parents and industries were also shared with math teachers at the other junior high school in Port Angeles. However, the project never took the intended next step of using the data to plan overall curriculum changes.

The team-teaching plan did not fare much better. Team teaching required scheduling the classes of the teachers involved back to back. Two seventh-grade teachers were the only ones who were able to get the schedule adjustments they needed to coordinate their instruction. These two teachers worked together during the 1974-75 academic year and were pleased with their accomplishments. Their success prompted other teachers to discuss similar cooperation. However, the schedule that enabled them to cooperate in 1974-75 could not be arranged again in 1975-76, and cooperation between other teachers remained at the talking stage.

With regard to disruptive students, the intended strategy was to focus on improving teachers' skills in working with them. Tasks listed here were: identifying the types of students involved, examining teachers' attitudes toward these students, improving teachers' attitudes through in-service work, investigating how other schools handled disruptive students, and cooperating with local social agencies.

The project ultimately spurred a constructive response to the problem of disruptive students, although the problem was taken out of the

project's hands soon after it was first raised. A subcommittee started to work on the problem in summer 1975, then delayed any further action until it was clear that the project itself would get additional funds. In the meantime, because the behavior of the students involved was a long-standing concern and because the school district had no clear policy on it, the Roosevelt staff filed a grievance. Thus, by the time project funds did come through in October 1975, the problem had taken on a political coloring. Then when the project sought the help of Roosevelt's counselors in identifying the types of students involved, the school's administration objected strongly and blocked that line of inquiry. Dispirited by this outcome, project personnel backed away, hoping that the policy aspects would be handled by the grievance procedure.

The outcome of the grievance procedure was more salutary: The Port Angeles Education Association was asked to develop a recommendation for district policy on student attendance and conduct, which was adopted by the school board in fall 1975.

While the Port Angeles Education Association was developing its recommendation, the project sponsored or stimulated some activities on less sensitive aspects of the problem. Among them were two inservice education programs on William Glasser's "Schools Without Failure" and a visit to another school. The focus of all three activities was "alternative programs," that is, options to large-group instruction in self-contained classrooms.

Partly as a result of these activities, the school administration, the school board, and the Port Angeles Education Association together formed a committee in fall 1975 to recommend district policy on alterna-

tive programs in general and on guidelines for implementing such programs. Their recommendations were adopted in spring 1976. Soon afterward, planning began for the district's first alternative program, to focus on disruptive students. The program was scheduled to begin in fall 1976 with 80 students in grades 9-12. Grades 7 and 8 will be included in the program in later years.

By spring 1975 the project at Roosevelt was inactive. No vote was taken; it simply ceased to be viable. However, many of the project's aims survived it. Clearly, the district was responding constructively to teachers' concerns about disruptive students. Also, the two seventh-grade teachers who team-taught math and homeroom in 1974-75 were trying again for back-to-back classes in 1976-77, and a shop teacher and math teacher were seeking a similar arrangement. Additionally, interest in inservice education generated at both Roosevelt Junior High School and Port Angeles Senior High School as a result of the projects, was picked up by the Port Angeles Education Association, which voted in January 1976 to "continue association with /the National Education Association and the Washington Education Association/ as a total association rather than within two buildings." The intent of the vote was to have the Association assume an active role in the development of inservice education policies and activities in collaboration with the district. Following the vote the Association formed an inservice education committee.

Local Evaluation

Local evaluation of the Roosevelt project was essentially limited to the reflections of one of the project's codirectors. Noting that the pro-

ject accomplished little beyond data collection, he attributed the project's inability to move forward to numerous factors:

- loss of his first two codirectors within about a year of the project's start, which weakened the project's leadership;
- stop-and-go funding, which broke the pace of teachers' efforts and left them intermittently uncertain about the project's future;
- turnover in the top administrative positions in the district one year after the project started, which raised questions about the new administration's commitment to and understanding of the project;
- conflict with Roosevelt's principal, who withdrew his support when the disruptive-student problem became a project concern;
- the compartmentalization of the faculty, which made communication difficult;
- not enough help from the Washington Education Association, the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, or the National Education Association on how to do what the project was designed to do; project personnel needed help, for example, in how to plan, organize, keep records, work with colleagues, and evaluate.

The codirector felt that the project was a good idea, that the needs identified were important ones, but that a broader base was required for teacher-designed reform--either through a direct alliance with the high school project or through active sponsorship of both projects by the Port Angeles Education Association.

Port Angeles Senior High School[6]

Port Angeles Senior High School, the town's single public high school, has an enrollment in grades 10-12 of about 1,200, including a minority population of Indian students. In fall 1974, faculty and staff numbered 68.

Teachers at Port Angeles Senior High School learned about the Teacher-Designed Reform project in January 1974 through a new faculty member who had transferred from Roosevelt Junior High. In the beginning months of 1974, a small group of the faculty identified a focus for the high school's involvement, and school board approval was obtained in early March. Two weeks later, the school's faculty association also approved the plan and a committee of 16 members was formed to carry it out.

The project's focus was to be the improvement of communications, an area judged by both students and teachers to be in need of attention according to an earlier survey by the University of Washington. "Poor communication was deemed the cause of the school's low morale and negative attitude toward the school as evidenced in the dropout rate, vandalism, poor attendance at athletic events, and little participation in extracurricular activities."

The planning committee proposed to alleviate the communication problem by sponsoring a series of events in late spring and fall 1974:

- a student assembly on "How to Get Out of Your Own Way";
- a follow-up seminar for students and faculty;

---

[6]Quotations in this section were taken from reports written by Susan Quick, project recorder.

- a day-and-a-half retreat for faculty before the opening of school in the fall;
- a campus clean-up program involving faculty and students;
- a half-day of inservice education to review accomplishments and redefine goals.

"The object of the assembly was to help students develop a better view of themselves and to help them unlock their potential talents." In interviews following the assembly, students said that they had found it "interesting," and some "felt it gave them good ideas on how to become a better student. A common complaint was that there was no follow-up in classes." The follow-up seminar that had been planned was cancelled when enrollment fell short of the number needed to make it go financially. Project personnel attributed the lack of interest to cost, short notice, and the scheduling of the seminar for June, after school was out for the summer.

The fall faculty retreat "was by far the project's biggest success in terms of facilitating the growth of communication among faculty members . . . . The committee's hopes were high that a united faculty could positively identify some needed reform, could brainstorm some innovative projects to improve the student and teacher morale, could explore what their professional and personal roles are in the classroom so that the image projected to the students is a positive one, and could help decide how the project should develop during the school year. The expectations were high and yet the faculty lived up to them; to an extent, all of the above goals were met during the faculty retreat."

The clean-up program was another success. The school itself is campus-style, consisting of six one-story buildings and a gymnasium, separated by lawns but connected by covered walkways. Prior to the program, the grounds were ill-kempt and unadorned. The clean-up noticeably altered this uncared-for appearance--litter disappeared, geraniums and petunias filled beds adjacent to buildings, and lawns were groomed.

Equally important, the activity generated good feeling. The hour of school time set aside for outdoor clean-up "was packed with high energy. There were free cokes, music blared from huge amplifiers, and the people were laughing. There were the usual leaf fights and stuffing-grass-down-the-shirt tricks, but it was all in fun and a lot of work was accomplished. Some students and faculty even stayed through their lunch hour to finish cleaning up the garbage. Student and teacher communications seemed especially good in this out-of-the-classroom setting."

For the classrooms themselves, the project got money from the school for paint, and teachers and students together covered the institutional greens, greys, and browns with bold colors of their own choosing.

The project's next activity, a half day of inservice education in October, was far less successful: "The enthusiasm and positive energy generated by the project seemed to disintegrate. Grumbles were heard such as 'All we ever do is set goals--we never do anything' /and/ 'We've wanted these reform for years--they'll never happen.'" Over two-thirds of the faculty in attendance judged the activity to have been "a waste of time."

"After the disheartening evaluation the planning committee gathered to decide what to do about the present low level of action and enthusi-

asm . . . . The function of the whole project was questioned and it was decided that it was worthwhile but it needed less talk and more action." A steering committee of four persons was formed to work as an action group. They agreed on four activities for the remainder of the year:

- a newsletter through which faculty could share information about techniques and innovations;
- a spring half-day retreat for faculty at which a panel of central office administrators would respond to questions;
- a second student assembly and follow-up seminar on improving self-image;
- a pancake breakfast for seniors, cooked and served by the faculty.

All these activities were well received except the faculty newsletter, which was discontinued after the first issue--"no stories=no interest."

Additionally, the project obtained a $300 grant to support the establishment of a Youth Hot Line by a local council of representatives from youth-serving agencies in Port Angeles. This temporary alliance of the project and the council arose because of their common interest in improving communication with young people in the community.

"In terms of /the/ eight procedural steps . . . /Port Angeles Senior High School/ focused on Step 6, which deals with examining the needed changes in the ways students and teachers communicate between and among each other." However, other steps were undertaken too, in the hope that they might contribute to the improvement of communication. Thus, with regard to Step 1, the project got the Port Angeles Education Association to conduct a teacher needs assessment district-wide, which largely confirmed the planning committee's impressions about concerns at the high

school. Also, the project implemented Step 3 in part, seeking information from other schools on factors contributing to high student morale. Additionally, the ideal school and changes needed to attain it were topics of discussion at faculty meetings, the retreat, and the half day of inservice education.

At the high school, as at Roosevelt Junior High School, the project did not enjoy the support of the principal. The principal was new to the high school in 1973-74, the year the project was launched there (in spring). Initially he backed the project and cooperated in its activities. Soon, however, he began to see it as a threat to his authority, and viewed the efforts of the planning committee with suspicion and distrust.

Like the project at Roosevelt, the high school project gradually ceased to function as a building effort in fall 1975; its last activity was another retreat for faculty before school opened. However, many of the project's programs were continued by other means. The faculty took over sponsorship of the pancake breakfast for seniors, and the associated student body assumed annual responsibility for campus beautification. Also, a course called Positive Image Psychology was introduced into the curriculum.

Local Evaluation

Local evaluation of the project's first year took the form of questionnaires completed by faculty immediately after several events, a questionnaire distributed to faculty at the end of the year, the October 1974 review of accomplishments, progress reports that served as a log of hopes and realities, and the collective impressions of the steering committee. The year's record, according to these sources, was one of alternating

high and low points, each success generating new or renewed enthusiasm, each failure dampening spirits.

The year-end questionnaire was distributed to all faculty members but only 10 returned it. They noted the accomplishment of several particular project activities plus the following general observations:

- "beginning to bridge communication gap among faculty;"
- "teacher image improved/staff involvement with students."

On the other hand, "continued, sustained rapport among teachers" was viewed as not having been accomplished.

The project's recorder concluded that 1974-75 was "just a beginning for the project at PAHS. The committee . . . attempted to unite the faculty in a way no other group . . . ever tried at PAHS. It ran up against some walls, as must be expected, but it broke down some walls too. Teachers moved just a little bit out of their authoritarian role and became 'human' to the students during clean-up day, arranging the image seminar, and planning the pancake breakfast. The faculty got to know each other's personal philosophies on education and on change at the high school through the fall retreat, [the half-day of inservice education], and planning committee meetings. The faculty bridged some of the communication gap between itself and the administration through the panel discussion . . . at the spring retreat. These all led to an increase in communication; the project's major goal for the year was accomplished."

Epilogue

One of the significant lessons learned in Bellingham and Port Angeles, as well as in the earlier projects in California and Oregon, was that teacher-designed reform in teacher education is difficult, if not impossible, to realize at the school building level without the sustained active support of the local association, building administrators, and district administrators. All three projects were officially sponsored by their local associations and had the approval of their school administrations, but neither sponsorship nor approval smoothed the way for teachers in their pursuit of reform. Obstructions abounded at both building and district levels, and passive support from the local association did not suffice to overcome them.

The insurmountability of these obstructions led project leaders at the state and national levels to begin thinking in 1975 of changing the project's approach from local association sponsorship with district sign-off to sponsorship by a consortium in which representatives of the local association, the district, and an institution of higher education had equal say on policy matters. The idea of such a consortium, appealing in itself, was particularly attractive in the state of Washington because it was in step with a movement by the State Board of Education to put the governance of teacher education on a tripartite basis. Consortia had already been developed for some preservice programs in the state, but none had yet encompassed inservice education. With the groundwork laid by the Teacher-Designed Reform project, both Bellingham and Port Angeles offered opportunities to pioneer consortia on inservice education.

The idea was introduced by state and national project leaders at both Port Angeles and Bellingham early in 1975 and raised again that spring. At Parkview, it initially went unheard because the project was going to be terminated. However, it was also introduced from another source, Western Washington State College, whose representative hesitated to continue the College's relationship with Parkview without a firmer base in collaborative governance. Thus, continuation of Parkview as a special Teacher Corps project was broached with Bellingham's administration in the context of a consortium of Western Washington State College, the Bellingham Education Association, and Bellingham School District. The commitment of all three parties was secured, and the Parkview project shifted in 1975-76 to the aegis of the developing consortium. As modified by its relationship with the Teacher Corps in 1975-76, the Parkview project is currently enjoying wide discussion as a model for the national Teacher Corps. In the view of the Teacher Corps program director at Western Washington State College, this is possibly the most significant outcome of the Teacher-Designed Reform project.

Newer to teacher-designed reform and lacking close ties to a particular college or university, Port Angeles was not ready to move on the consortium idea so quickly, but local association leaders expressed interest in hearing more about it. Therefore, state and national project leaders hired a consultant to help the association explore the possibilities and make plans. In the late winter and spring of the 1975-[illegible] school year, the consultant met several times with association leaders and members of the association's inservice education committee, helping the association clarify its goals and identify its resources. In the meantime, the as-

sociation was pressing the school district to participate in a joint in-service education committee.

By May 1976, a joint committee had been formed. The district agreed to provide funds for inservice education and to develop all inservice policies and activities with and through the committee. Both the district and the association agreed that there would be open, shared views with mutual commitment to a common cause--the development of a long-range program of inservice education.

Initially, the joint committee is considering how to analyze inservice education needs, including the relationship of individual faculty needs to those of building and district. The emphasis on studying student characteristics and needs in the Teacher-Designed Reform project will be continued in the district-wide effort. The earlier effort to improve communication among faculty, students, and administration has also affected the initial planning of the committee. Processes that will involve faculty, students, and administration by building are being developed.

The committee has made a number of contacts with institutions of higher learning for possible assistance in inservice activities, and it expects, over time, to develop cooperative if not collaborative programs with one or more of them. Initial emphasis, however, is on development of collaboration between the district and the association.

Spin-off from the Teacher-Designed Reform project is also evident at the state level. A plan for inservice education currently being developed by Washington's Office of the State Superintendent for Public Instruction is incorporating the basic principles of the project, and

the state is also considering the principle of teacher-designed inservice education as it revises its certification standards to encompass career-long development.

Results

A number of results can be identified as issuing from the project. The interim report declared that claiming "concrete results of any far-reaching nature . . . would be unwise, dishonest, and inaccurate" (Edelfelt et al, 1972, p. 15). That may still be the case. So the concern here is mainly with events that actually took place and developments that clearly occurred because of the project. How far-reaching they are, only time will tell, and the degree to which results can be replicated at other schools will need to be tested.

Some of the following results were identified in the interim report, but the reporting here is altered or expanded to incorporate more recent evidence. In most cases, results are generalized for all sites. Where such generalization is not warranted, the statement is qualified appropriately.

1. Teachers were caused to focus more on students as a result of the project. Although attention at first was drawn from what is to be taught to who is to be taught and how, the pendulum did swing back a way toward content concerns. Initially the study of students was attractive and interesting. As the projects moved along, study of students was less prominent.
2. The project created some havoc with the status quo. Teacher-administrator working relationships were challenged, teacher roles were questioned, intra-staff conflicts and strife were uncovered, and teacher association roles in this type of endeavor were questioned.

3. The individual projects caused exploration of new roles for professional associations--for example, initiators of a design for inservice education to improve school program, instigators of child study and parent surveys, advocates of policy designed to keep teachers current, etc.
4. The project called attention to ways of studying children and stimulated the creation of new avenues of communication between students and teachers. At some sites communication between teachers and parents was improved. However, not nearly enough was accomplished in either child study or improved communication with parents.
5. At some sites the isolation of colleges from schools was demonstrated. The one site that survived from the beginning developed more contacts and relationships with higher education personnel. But the rules of interaction were constantly being reexamined. There seemed always to be the need to remind college people of the parity that teachers wanted in decision-making, whether it was in the selection and assignment of interns or matters related to inservice education.
6. The projects uncovered some latent and subliminal hostility, conflict, and jealousy among professional personnel. It became obvious again and again that people in schools need to learn and relearn ways to work together and to find ways to share power and decision-making.
7. It became clear that commitment to doing more than teaching students during scheduled time varied considerably among teachers.

Whether or not there is time to do more than teach students in scheduled classes is a question of considerable importance. Even teachers who gave time and energies beyond the classroom agreed that teaching loads should be altered to provide time for curriculum development, instructional improvement, and in-service education.

8. Delving into the prospects of including matters of instruction and professional development (teacher education) in negotiated agreements opened a "can of worms." It uncovered administrators' commitments to keep negotiations separate from instruction and professional development. However, teachers discovered that collective bargaining is not the only way to change school policy. Often when administrators and school boards saw a needed change in policy pointed out by teacher action or experimentation, they made that change before any proposal for such policy was raised in negotiations.
9. The organization and support of projects like this one need some altering to be more effective. During the first phase of the project, two leaders from each site met with state and national project leaders, state department staff, and consultants in seminar sessions to make the broad decisions that guided site operations. This approach proved effective, but it excluded the majority of site participants from some significant discussions and learning. It also created some jealousy--or at least envy--on the part of the excluded participants, both because they missed out on site-to-site sharing and the overall project decision-making, and be-

cause they missed some interesting trips and work sessions. During the second phase the system was changed. State and national project leaders, state department staff, and consultants visited each site about three times a year, working directly with all the teachers and other personnel involved. This approach brought together the people involved in the project and provided better communication than the initial approach. Additionally, it enabled state and national staff to have direct contact with teachers and the local action. However, the visits were too infrequent and too short. Also, they came to be seen as inspection visits. Ideally, a combination of both approaches would be desirable if more resources were available, particularly if additional people could participate in cross-site seminars and if site visits could be more frequent and longer.

Conclusions

Conclusions are here defined as summing up what happened to the people involved. They are the perceptions of the writer, but they are based on all the reports submitted, the observations of several consultants, and the views of outside evaluators.

1. Minimum funds, when used in ways that intimately involve teachers in establishing purpose and direction, can enable teachers to get a much broader perspective of the school's purpose and their roles as teachers.
2. Giving teachers time to observe and study learners by providing personnel to spell teachers can be tremendously effective, particularly when clear purposes for study and observation are set by the teachers themselves.
3. Even when a project in instruction and professional development is initiated, planned, and sponsored by a teacher association, members (teachers) have difficulty in distinguishing what they do under the auspices of the association and what they do as employees of the school district.
4. Progress in a project like this is more likely when the major emphasis is not directly on good teaching but on the factors that contribute to good teaching, such as knowing more about oneself, about students, about students' families, and about the aspirations of both parents and students.
5. Some criteria for participation by building-level faculties (see pp. 9-10) were unrealistic. For example, expecting projects to

keep adequate records (logs) of plans and accomplishments proved unfeasible. Teachers had neither the time nor sufficient incentive. Teachers also did not see their role as record-keepers, not because they thought records were unimportant but because their time was consumed by other duties.

6. The role of the local association in this project was poorly conceived. It was assumed that the local association could take initiative and provide support and surveillance for a building project that dealt with curriculum and instructional improvement and inservice education. As it turned out, those matters are quite clearly school district responsibilities, at least in the legal sense. The project demonstrated that the local association can be effectively involved in initiating, monitoring, influencing, and forcing evaluation of activities in curriculum and instructional improvement and inservice education, but that the local district must assume responsibility for managing and financing them and be accountable for the outcomes. Teachers, however, as school employees, can and should strongly influence the shape and direction of these activities; and as association members, they can and should monitor, criticize, and negotiate policy. Distinctions between school district and teacher association roles in instruction and professional development are still unclear and subject to debate.
7. Projects like Teacher-Designed Reform in Teacher Education are not easily transferred from one building to another. If a project at one building is too highly touted, jealousy and resent-

ment develop in other buildings. Building faculties and student bodies are sufficiently unique that they must discover their own problems, difficulties, programs, and solutions. There are things to learn, but learning seems easier across districts than within districts.

8. Cooperative working relationships among local, state, and national associations are difficult at times. Most of the work in this project fell to local teachers. State and national association participants were largely staff people, and they visited sites only periodically in the second phase (not at all during the first phase) for consultation purposes. Differences in expectations created problems. Communication was not always easy or clear. Perceived or real status differences, although rarely voiced, strained rapport among people at different levels, and local teachers sometimes saw themselves being used for purposes other than their own.
9. Teachers find it difficult to recognize progress over time. The teachers in this project were so deeply involved that perspective was difficult. They were so deeply involved, in fact, that change often went unrecognized because the past was forgotten and the present seemed to be what had always been. Teachers were often overcommitted and under-rewarded--and almost always overworked. The project was an addition to regular teaching duties.
10. There is no adequate reward system for teachers who engage in projects such as this one. Reward means more than monetary re-

turn; it includes recognition, additional freedom, and new privileges.

11. Teacher associations must allocate more staff and funds to projects such as this one if there is to be adequate consultation, supervision, and training.
12. Teacher education institutions are poorly prepared to provide services that enable teachers to revitalize their school programs and improve their own performance.
13. The consistent and steady support of the state department of education is invaluable in providing assistance and consultation to school sites and in providing a direct link between experimental projects and state planning for inservice education.
14. The role and competence of the principal are important factors in the success of a project such as this one. The principal contributes significantly to teacher roles in decision-making. Where the principal saw his or her role as a supporter and facilitator of teacher involvement in decision-making, projects succeeded; where the principal offered resistance, projects suffered. The principal also serves as the main contact with parents and with the central office. He or she is the main link, then, with two important parties who must understand a project of this sort.
15. Special projects should be organized to lead somewhere. They should not just terminate when grants run out. At three of the sites for this project, direct links were successfully developed with established programs: Parkview School became a Teacher Corps site and has continued to probe innovative approaches to

inservice education; in Port Angeles, the local association and the district formed a joint committee that is developing an in-service education program for the whole district.

16. Teacher skills in decision-making obviously need to be at a high level in a project like this one. Where sufficient skill is not present, and this was sometimes the case, sophistication in decision-making will need to be developed. That task was not done adequately in this project. It should have been a first and continuing order of business.

References

Edelfelt, R. A., Drummond, W. H., Sharpe, D. M., & Williams, L. Teacher designed reform in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1972.

Greenwood, P. W., Mann, D., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. III: The process of change. (Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. R-1589/3-HEW) Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation, 1975.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C. Denemark, G. W., & Nash, R. J. Educating a profession: Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education. Abstract of a proposal to the Office of Education, May 1973.

Appendix A

Texts of Selected Inservice Education Policies Negotiated Between the Bellingham Education Association and Bellingham School District

Inservice Training

1. When any five certified employees of the District file a written request for a specific inservice training program, the Superintendent or his delegate shall meet with those persons to determine whether the course is feasible and to work out the details of its implementation. If the program is agreed upon, the Superintendent or his delegate will appoint one of the initiators as coordinator to be responsible for the evaluation and mechanics of the course.

2. The written request will include the following:

   a. Purpose of the desired training

   b. Content of the proposed course

   c. Names of resource people to assist in the course, if possible at that time

   d. Length of the course and the desired meeting time

   e. Names of those people desiring to participate in the course

   f. A request for a specific appointment with the Superintendent or his delegate

3. Proposed Conditions

   a. Such inservice training will count for professional credit; the amount to be agreed upon by the Superintendent and the /Bellingham Education Association Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee/.

   b. The school district will provide funds to cover costs of the program subject to the approval of the Superintendent.

   c. Information about the scheduled course shall be published in the #501 Bulletin, Chalkboard or by other means so that interested teachers and administrators may also join the class.

   d. Such inservice training shall not necessarily be limited to the regular school year.

e. One of the functions of the Improvement of Instruction Committee will be to survey the faculties each spring to determine what kind of inservice training would be most desirable for the coming school year.

f. The initiation and direction for inservice training has its source in the programs' initiators.

Professional Credit Policy

A. Thirty (30) units of individual development time related to current teaching responsibility or to certification requirements shall be earned during each five year period. These units must be filed with the superintendent of schools within one year of the time they are earned, with credit on non-college items subject to the approval of the appropriate assistant superintendent, with appeal to the superintendent.

Individual credits may be earned in the following ways:

1. College course — 1 credit = 10 units
2. In-service workshops — 1 hour = 1 unit
3. Curriculum Committees — 1 hour = 1 unit
4. Publication:

   a. Article listed in table of contents and published in a professional publication----------20 units

   b. Any other contribution to a professional journal-- 1 unit

   c. Book in teaching field----------30 units

5. Attendance at subject matter, behavior or gifted conference (limit one per year) — 1 hour = 1 unit

6. Presentation at subject matter, behavior or gifted conference (limit one per year) — 1 hour = 3 units

7. Travel related to teaching field - Maximum of 30 units for travel in any one five-year period. Thirty units to be granted for a trip outside the North American Continent or Hawaii, provided the trip is of at least two weeks duration. One unit will be allowed for each two weeks of travel in North America or the Hawaiian Islands. A report of places visited, route of travel, length of time in travel, must be submitted with your application.

B. An additional thirty (30) units of staff development time related to teaching shall be earned during each five year period. These hours may be earned in the following way:

1. District in-service 1 hour = 1 unit

District inservice is defined as planned staff development held either by the district or a specific building to meet defined needs approved by the appropriate assistant superintendent.

C. College credits related to current teaching responsibility or to certification requirements may be substituted for "B" above.

Appendix B

Staff Who Participated in the Project on Teacher-Designed Reform in Teacher Education

Parkview Elementary School

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Beatrice Aubert, teacher		
Jess Brewster, teacher	Chairperson of Human Rights Commission	Building Test Coordinator, Testing Commission
Betty Brown, teacher aide		
Emma Conlee, teacher	Member of Human Rights Commission	Member of Third-Grade Social Studies and Language Committees
Sharon Demert, teacher		
Ruth DeWitz, teacher	Building representative	
Katherine Ellis, teacher		
Marielyn Frazier, teacher and former project co-chairperson	Chairperson of TEPS Committee	
Ellener Grimes, teacher		Chairperson of Kindergarten Grade Level
Virginia Henderson, teacher aide		
Nancy Hildebrand, teacher and project team leader	Member of Local Negotiations Commission Member of State Commission on Discipline and Disruptive Student	

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Ruth Hilliard, teacher	Member of Teacher Welfare Committee	
Ailsa Horeck, teacher aide		
Anita Jorgensen, teacher		
Audrey Knutsen, teacher	Member of State Commission on House Bill 90	
Cindy LaVeck, teacher		
Barbara Locke, teacher aide		
Dale Miller, teacher	Building representative	Member of Science Committee
Chris Moore, speech therapist		
Wilma Phillips, teacher aide		
Patricia Pierce, teacher		
Alice Pohlman, school psychologist		
Philip Raiguel, teacher		
Lois Reynolds, teacher		
Diana Shapiro, Tutor-counselor for First Americans		
Gil Thurston, principal and former project co-chairperson		

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Dave Tierney, teacher	Building representative	
Karen Wayerski, teacher		
Cynthia Webley, teacher		Chairperson of First-Grade Level

Roosevelt Junior High School

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Asylda Bilsborrow, teacher		
Charles Byrd, teacher		
Ron Carr, teacher		
Sharon Carrell, teacher	Former building representative	
Rosemarie Chaisson, guidance counselor		
Dave Drovdahl, teacher		
Gary Gleason, teacher	Chairperson of Curriculum Committee and project co-chairperson	
Jack Halstead, teacher	Building representative	Member of association-district Inservice Education Committee
J. C. Kilmer, teacher		
Dwaine Konshak, teacher		
Lyle Lindelien, former guidance counselor and former project co-chairperson		
Wayne Gason, former principal		
Richard McDougall, teacher	Former negotiator	

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Arlene Morganroth, teacher	Former building representative	
Lee Porterfield, teacher and project co-chairperson		
Audrea Robertson, former teacher and former project co-chairperson		
Robert Ross, teacher	Former president	
Charlotte Sanderson, teacher	Former building representative	
Jim Widsteen, guidance counselor		

Port Angeles High School

	Association Involvement	School District Involvement
Connie Collins, teacher	Building representative	
Estel Cornett, teacher		
Mary Davis, teacher	Building representative	
Jack Foote, teacher		
Sandi Hartmann, teacher	Former President	Chairperson of association-district inservice education committee
Russ Hesselman, teacher	Treasurer	
Esther Hyland, teacher		
John Kumpula, teacher		
Connie Lawrence, teacher		
Lyle Lindelien, guidance counselor and project chairperson		
Gary McLaughlin, teacher	President-elect, chief negotiator	
Susan Quick, former teacher		
Jim Rexroat, teacher		
Jim Warren, teacher	Committee Chairperson	